

Sci / Kraus v 46  
1-29-6

NEW YORK POST

JAN 31 1960

1-Pers 2 S. Symington  
1-Pers 2 P.E. Roosevelt

1-Pal 3

*My Day*

# By ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

On the same page of one of our New York City newspapers the other day we read two head-lines that seemed to contradict each other.

One read: "Eisenhower Calls U. S. Strategic Scores Pessimists." The other read: "Juggling of Missile Data Is Charged by Symington."

To the average reader this means complete confusion. One cannot believe that the President would wilfully mislead the country at large. His statement was made to Republican dinners all over the country and before making such a statement he must have made a very careful check of exactly where we stand in this whole defense situation.

What Sen. Symington says is that our interest in balancing the budget is greater than our hostility and that, therefore, we have not been accurate in reporting what intelligence has reported as to Soviet strength.

It is hard to believe that a Senator, who is judged to be well-versed in these matters, would falsify a statement as serious as this. And if he did, it seems probable that there would be an immediate correction from those in authority.

What is the poor layman to believe?

I have a letter from the Southwest area of our country, saying that one of our well-known newspaper writers, in speaking privately to people in that area, has said that Vice President Nixon will be the next President.

He also said that if Sen. Kennedy does not win the Democratic nomination on the first two ballots at the national convention, there probably will be a deadlock between Kennedy and Sen. Humphrey. This then, he reasons, would force the Democrats to nominate Sen. Symington as the compromise candidate.

I have one very definite feeling. Being a Democrat, I would prefer to see a Democrat elected President this coming autumn, and what energy I have will certainly be devoted to that end.

The Republicans are growing so accustomed to having no contest in their conventions—having had two conventions—in which it was obvious from the beginning that President Eisenhower was going to be the candidate—that I suppose it is impossible for them to differ about a candidate.

But sometimes differences of opinion are assets, and too much agreement often can bring about indifference. So, to state now who will be the next President seems to me a bit premature.

NEW YORK POST, SUNDAY, JANUARY 31, 1960 \$4.7